

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| RALPH HOWARD BLAKELY, |) | CASE NO. C07-1803-RAJ-MAT |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER RE: PENDING MOTIONS |
| |) | |
| HERB SNIVELY, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

Plaintiff Ralph Howard Blakely proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights case. Plaintiff filed a motion to compel production of documents (Dkt. 45), a motion for discovery extension (Dkt. 48), and a motion to compel cooperation with a request for interrogatories to defendant Dr. John David Kenney (Dkt. 50). Defendants oppose plaintiff's motions to compel (Dkts. 46 & 52), but have no objection to the extension request (Dkt. 49). Having considered all documents filed in support and in opposition to the pending motions, as well as the remainder of the record, the Court does hereby find and ORDER:

(1) Plaintiff seeks an order compelling the production of documents. (Dkt. 45.) However, plaintiff filed his motion simultaneously with his request for production of documents.

01 As noted by defendants, they have thirty days to respond to plaintiff's requests. Fed. R. Civ. P.
02 34(b)(2)(A). Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to compel production of documents is DENIED as
03 premature.

04 (2) Plaintiff also seeks to compel the cooperation of defense counsel in responding to
05 interrogatories related to defendant Dr. John David Kenney. (Dkt. 50.) However, a review of
06 defendants' responses to the interrogatories in question reveals that defendants raised timely and
07 appropriate objections. (Dkt. 52, Ex. B.) As such, plaintiff's motion to compel cooperation is
08 DENIED.

09 (3) Plaintiff seeks a ninety-day extension of discovery and other deadlines in this case.
10 (Dkt. 48.) He asserts that his many requests for specific discovery documents have been denied
11 and that responses to his first request for interrogatories are due after the completion of discovery.
12 Defendants do not object to the request so long as the cut-off date for filing and hearing
13 dispositive motions is also extended. The Court previously granted, upon defendants' request, a
14 ninety-day extension of the discovery deadline in this case, extending the discovery cut-off date
15 to June 3, 2008, the dispositive motion deadline to July 1, 2008, and the joint pretrial statement
16 deadline to September 23, 2008. (Dkt. 29.) The Court does not find adequate support presented
17 for plaintiff's request for an additional ninety-day extension. However, the Court GRANTS the
18 request for an extension in part by extending the deadlines for an additional forty-five days. The
19 deadlines in this case are hereby revised as follows: (a) discovery cutoff – **July 18, 2008** ; (b)
20 dispositive motion deadline – **August 18, 2008**; and (c) joint pretrial statement deadline –
21 **November 17, 2008**.

22 (4) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to defendants, and

01 to the Honorable Richard A. Jones.

02 DATED this 24th day of June, 2008.

03 

04 Mary Alice Theiler
05 United States Magistrate Judge
06
07
08
09
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22